

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Choi (U.S. 6,932,380).

**Claims 1-20 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Choi (U.S. 6,932,380). The Applicant respectfully notes that Choi does not claim the same invention as the present application and the Applicant is therefore prepared to file an affidavit swearing behind this reference. However, as the Choi reference not only does not claim the same invention as the present Application but also fails to teach its limitations, the Applicant will proceed with a traversal and utilize a affidavit swearing behind if necessary.

With all respect, the Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections. The area referred to by the Examiner as 162 is the mounting area of the airbag itself 136 (see paragraph 43 page 3). This is not the equivalent of the claimed wing element. Furthermore, 162 cannot extend transversely FROM the mounting area as it represents the mounting area. It cannot extend transversely away from itself. Additionally the Examiner has taken separate elements (mounting surface 162, patch element 166, second patch 174) and attempted to find a limitation on each to read into the claimed limitations of a single element in the present application (the at least one wing element). This is improper and fails to properly evaluate the claimed limitations of the present invention.

The patch element 166, 174 shown in Choi extend purely vertically downward from the mount area 162. They do not extend transversely away from the mounting area as claimed by the present invention. As such, they fail to form a trampoline surface to engage passenger forward momentum. The only resistance of the patch elements in Choi would be to provide shear resistance not to act as a trampoline (which requires direct forward impact stretch). Secondly, it is the transverse extending nature of the present invention that allows significant forward resistance even in small packages and increases airbag engagement area. None of these advantages are shown or taught by the Choi reference. The Choi reference extends purely vertically down from the very edges of the mount surface. As this mount surface area decreases, so will the effectiveness of the Choi design. In contrast, extending the wing outwards from the mount area (as claimed by the present invention) allows the mount surface area to be greatly

reduced without a reduction in effectiveness. Furthermore, Choi fails to increase the airbag engagement area as does the present invention since any assumed wings extend vertically downward along a linear axis and not transverse outward from the airbag.


Choi additionally fails to teach the use of a slotted chamber extending outward in a transverse direction from the airbag module (What is claimed and what provides the horizontal trampoline surface) but instead all of Choi is contained within the airbag module area. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all the rejections.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his assistance. Applicant submits that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments that would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas E. Donohue  
Reg. No. 44,660  
Artz & Artz, P.C.  
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500  
(248) 223-9522 (Fax)

Dated: May 30, 2006